

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY REGISTER.

VOL. 39.—No. 14.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 7, 1821. [Price 6d.

*Published every Saturday Morning, at Six o'Clock.*

## THE AGRICULTURAL EVIDENCE.

This is not yet printed. Considering the *enormous price* paid for *parliament printing*, it is very strange that this Evidence should lag so long in the press. I would have had it *printed and out in 48 hours!* But there is, evidently no desire to get it before the Public. Come out it must, nevertheless; and, when it does come, I shall re-publish it, along with the *Report*, which is already re-published and to be sold (price 1s.) at the Office of the Register. When the Evidence comes, the whole will be re-published in a volume; the paragraphs (as I stated in my last) will be *numbered*; and then, in two Registers, I intend to *examine both*, and to refer to the several paragraphs as I proceed.—In a late Register I notice a publication by a *Clerk in the Mint*, named MUSHETT, and said I would answer it and blow it to air. But, the appearance of the *Agricultural Report* has induced me to change my plan; for, there is, in that Report, that which will naturally introduce

Mr. MUSHETT's statements in favour of the *Fund-lords*; and, if I were to notice fully those statements *before-hand*, I should be compelled to *repeat* literally, or to dislocate the discussion, neither of which I wish to do. In the meanwhile, the proceedings of the "*Collective Wisdom of the Nation*," as Mr. PERRY calls it, demands our attention; for, strange as it may appear, at first sight, at least, people seem to have almost forgotten that *there is a "Collective Wisdom,"* just at the very time when its proceedings become singularly interesting. However, about these proceedings I am now about to speak a little to the old and tried friend of us Reformers, Mr. GEORGE CANNING, of Gloucester Lodge, in the County of Middlesex.

TO

MR. CANNING.

*On Bilk'ing the "Crib."*

Kensington, 4. July, 1821.

SIR,

Many a letter have I addressed to you; but, always, heretofore,

2 R

with a distant prospect of seeing you brought to reason. The object *now* approaches us. If we do not actually see the port, or the land, the colour of the water changes, the ripples begin to appear, and every thing indicates that land is a head. The boundless ocean of extravagance, waste, official profligacy, and insolence, is behind us, and we are fast getting the system amongst the shallows of "*Retrenchment and Economy*;" words more dreadful to it than was the hand writing on the wall to the Babylonish tyrant.

The discussions in the "Grand Council of the Nation," relative to *retrenchment*, or in more common phrase, "*bilking the Crib*;" the *altered tone* of the ministers; the *cause of this altered tone*; their school-boy-like *promises of amendment*; the evident *consequences* of a fulfilment of those promises if they be fulfilled; the not less evident consequences of a *non-fulfilment*: these, Sir, are to form the subject of this letter; a subject in which we are all interested, but, amongst us all, no two men more deeply than you and I.

But, first, let me remark on that rare and wonderful *silence* that you have been able to im-

pose upon yourself during these discussions. You were not wont to be thus sparing of words. You have never until now been backward in offering your opinions, and that, too, in no very timid manner. What, then, can be the cause of your present silence? That philosophy is not sound, which tells us that political courage fails where personal prowess begins; for, I am sure your experience has convinced you, that a man may be lamentably deficient in both at one and the same time. Therefore, it cannot be that your display of energy in the pursuit of "Glory" has enfeebled your political heroism; and yet, there must be a cause, seeing that no effect is without one.

Shall I guess at this cause, coming as I did, not long ago, from a country of great guessers? With your leave I will. Pitt was told (*Pilot Pitt*), in his younger spouting days, and before you and I came upon the stormy stage, that he was like the young man mentioned by LOCKE, in illustration of the latter's doctrine of the association of ideas. This young man had learnt to dance admirably; but, he had been taught in a room where there was a *trunk* constantly standing,

and, as LOCKE relates, the trunk being removed, the young man could not dance at all! So it was, in the instance I allude to, said of Pitt, that some topic (I have forgotten what) on which he had been accustomed to harp and to ring his noisy changes, was absolutely necessary to be brought in, in order to give his tongue its due portion of oil. Now, I *guess*, that you have always, until now, had associated in your mind defiance of what you call clamour, and a *full treasury*, or "*Crib*;" and that, finding the *Crib* growing empty, your tongue, without your being able to say precisely why, is losing its wonted powers; for, as all philosophers agree, there is a strict sympathy between the tongue and the teeth!

Now, pray, Sir, do not imagine, that I here make any "*allusion to personal character*;" for, upon my word and honour and faith and soul I do not! And, therefore, "I cannot hesitate to *disclaim* having had such an *intention*." Hoping that this my "*frankness and promptitude* in disclaiming any "*intention of personal offence*," will save me from all terrific epistles from Gloucester Lodge, I shall, if you please, proceed a little further with my *guessing*.

I guess, then, that, when you were making your Six - Acts speeches; when you were, subsequently, putting forth your Liverpool-Pamphlet; when, at a later period, you were cheering Mr. Brougham for his defence of the employment of spies; and when, at a period still later, you resigned your place in the cabinet: I guess, that, at all these periods, you had not the smallest idea that there was danger of any but Radical revolution, and that you never so much as thought, or dreamed of a *revolution in the Crib*! I guess, that your talk, in 1816, of the *sun* of your prosperity being hidden, for a moment, behind a *cloud*, only to re-appear with more splendour than ever; and that your calling on the "*Great Council*," the "*Collective Wisdom*," to pass Peel's Bill by an unanimous vote, that *the subject might never be agitated again*: I guess that these may fairly be taken as undoubted proofs of your total blindness as to those causes which were then at work to produce, first a balking and last an emptiness of the *Crib*.

But, I guess, that, *now*, you begin to open your eyes, and that you see, that there are *others* besides Reformers (whom you, in

1809, called a *low, degraded crew*) to cry out against *taxes, salaries, pensions, sinecures, and grants*; and that you perceive, that those *others* are not to be put to silence even by *Six-Acts*! I guess, moreover, that you understand well the influence and power of the *Crib*; that you take it for granted, that all depends on its fulness; and that, no one need to tell you, that modern "loyalty" and "social order" must be in imminent danger, if, from whatever cause, the *Crib* be bilked in any considerable degree.

Lastly, I guess, that, seeing 'his new sort of complainants against the system arise! seeing those, whom you once characterized under the appellation of "*Landed Grandees*," no longer in a humour to allow of a quiet alienation of their estates; seeing that against these neither Acts nor Troops can be brought to bear; seeing that the *Crib* must be wholly emptied, or that a shock must be given, if not a death-blow, to the paper-tribe; seeing that out of this deadly conflict a *Reform* of some sort or other must inevitably arise; I guess, that, beholding all this, you have not known what to say, and have, therefore, at last, been brought to hold your tongue.

Your return to *place* has been represented as near at hand. To be sure, we have no better authority for this than that "unsailable and incorruptible being," Mr. JAMES PERRY, in favour of whom or for whose express sake, Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH wanted an *exception* made in the *banishment law*, and whom you "*had reason to know was worthy*" of Sir James's praises; for which Mr. PERRY paid you back in a fulsome address drawn up and seconded *by him* at the India House; and thus for an act on your part which words cannot adequately describe, you got your reward in being covered over with as foul slime as ever was hawked up from the putrid lungs of the body politic. This is our authority; and bad it is. I wish it were better, with all my heart; for I am extremely anxious to see you in the thick of the mess. I would if I could, terrific as the idea is, raise up PITT and DUNDAS, PERCEVAL and ROSE to be partakers in the winding up of the drama. But, *you*; you above all men now living, ought now to be a member of the Ministry. You have defended the Ministry through thick and through thin; you have been the very foremost in hosti-



lity to those by whom the system has been opposed. You have constantly eulogised it; constantly decried its adversaries; constantly called for punishment on the heads of those adversaries; and, therefore, to stand with this system or to fall with this system ought to be your lot.

I suspect, however, that you will have no relish for the adventure. There are now no Jacobins or Radicals to hunt down; and the crib is attacked in its very vitals. To the attacks now making on it I mean first to call your attention and that of the public. The crib; that is to say, the money expended upon offices and so forth, now appears to be upon the eve of being *bilked* to an extraordinary degree. Dr. JOHNSON is wrong in his definition of the meaning of the word *to bilk*. He says it means *to cheat* or *to defraud*. DRYDEN so uses it; but the word is a law word, and it means, to *withhold* money. For instance a servant is guilty of misconduct and of laziness or negligence. The master takes him before a Justice. The Justice can cancel the agreement between master and man, and authorise the master to withhold part of the wages due to the man, in compensation for the loss sus-

tained in consequence of the conduct of the latter towards the former. This is *bilking*, which, as you will clearly perceive, differs widely from *fining* or *mulcting*; which mean to take away *something that a man already has*.

Thus, then, if we regard the Treasury as the *Crib*, to take off taxes is to stop money from going into it; and this is, to all intents and purposes, a bilking of the Crib. That this work is already begun, you are but too well informed. The discussion and the vote on the 27th of last month must have convinced every one that a further and a further bilking of the Crib is now about to take place. As I observed in my last Register, the Ministers had not the courage to oppose the motion of Mr. Hume directly; nor to meet it by a motion on the previous question. They resorted to the miserable shift of an *amendment*, moved by one of their own constant friends and supporters.

And, now, Sir, let us see to what that amendment amounts. It calls upon the king, in terms as distinct as the nature of the case permits, to reduce the number of persons employed in the civil government; to diminish

the amount of the salaries, which have been increased since 1797 ; and, finally more especially to reduce the army and all other departments connected with the supplies !

This is a home thrust at the very pivot on which the system turns. And now let us see what are the grounds upon which this reduction is called for. It is called for by the *Landlords* ; because those Landlords find themselves upon the eve of being without income from the rent of their lands ! On this ground the Ministers own staunch friends ; who expressly stated that the Ministers ought to have commenced the work of reduction sooner ; and they added this observation well worthy of being implanted in your memory, that they regarded the motion of Mr. HUME as a censure upon the Ministers, and voted against it, and for the amendment, "*hoping*" (mark the words) ; hoping that "the Government would go *heart* and *hand* to promote the great objects of economy and relief."

This was plainly telling the Ministers that their friends would have voted against them if their own motion had not been tantamount to that of Mr. HUME. It

is, therefore, certain that the Crib must be bilked ; or, that these Ministers must be removed from their places.

The motion calls for a reduction of the number of persons employed in the civil departments. Here is a monstrous blow at patronage. Every discharged person from a friend becomes an enemy of the system ; and, as it is not very likely that that which is called interest will be asleep upon this occasion, a suitable quantity of envy and of heart burning will scarcely fail to arise from this operation on the crib. When a scanty portion of provender is put into, or remains in a crib surrounded by hungry cattle, we know what a strife they immediately set up ; but fill the crib, and they are friendly as can be—just so will it happen here. The diminution of the provender will set all into commotion ; especially as some are to be marked out for receiving no provender at all.

But, there is also to be a reduction of the salaries which have been augmented since ninety-seven, and which augmentation took place in consequence of the additional labour imposed on the offices by the war, or *in consequence of the diminished value of money*. I suppose that an expe-

rienced person like Mr. BANKES, must, when he drew up this address to the king, have been well aware that the allowances to the whole of the *Royal family* were twice augmented in consequence of a diminished value of money; that the salaries of the Judges were, at two augmentations, just doubled on the same ground; that the salaries of the police justices were also nearly if not quite doubled on the same ground; and thus it has gone on to the amount of hundreds of thousands of pounds per annum. So skilful and deeply experienced a person as Mr. BANKES must also have been aware, that enormous sums in retired allowances, and especially to retired ambassadors, have been added since the year 1797, and that too, expressly in consequence of the diminished value of money. In like manner the necessity of a revision of the pension list must have been in the contemplation of such a sedate, contemplative and knowing a person as Mr. BANKES. For, assuredly, those pensions must have been granted upon an estimate bottomed upon the then value of money; and consequently, they are now doubled in amount. There have been many large grants of money

made since 1797, in the shape of annuities still payable to the annuitants, amongst which the Duke of ATHOL is one. It is impossible to imagine any argument at all against the reduction of these annuitants. In Ireland, what a "fell swoop!" For, there are all the compensations for loss of offices!

So that, you see, Sir, there is no end to this thing. Your antagonist (if you will suffer me to call him so) will be deprived of his unsavory, and, as it turned out, unfortunate allusion to the Ass and the Crib; for really, the Crib will be but a very poor thing; but, then, we have the consolation of knowing from PAINE, that a poor government makes a rich people.

If Mr. BANKES was not aware of these things, the Ministers were; but still they thought it prudent to smother their mortification and alarm, and to assume a tone, or rather sink down into a tone, very pleasant to hear, but not heard before by this nation for more than half a century. Lord CASTLEREAGH made no attempt even to justify himself in not having begun to reduce sooner; and, during a subsequent evening, when the voting of money was going on, no less

than thirteen distinct promises were made not to ask for so much money next year. There never was any thing so completely altered as the tone of these ministers. The threat contained in Mr. Gooch's speech appears to have bereft them almost of their senses.

The truth is, they were flatly and plainly told, in the affair of the husbandry horse tax; they were told by their staunchest friends and supporters, that, if they persisted in opposing the repeal of that tax, those friends would quit them, and, of course, that they must quit their places, an alternative, which for more reasons than one, they cannot but look at with affright. It is very true that their successors would do no better than themselves, unless they struck at once at the heart of the system; but, such is their situation, that they must tremble at the want of success even of their successors.

For in the debate on the Bill for the repeal of the malt tax, Lord Castlereagh threatened, that without the tax he and his colleagues would not attempt to carry on the government. Pretty nearly the same was said by Mr. VANSITTART and Mr. HUSKISSON, at the indiscretion, of which last

I wonder, during the first debate on the husbandry horse bill, and, even in the debate upon the address to the King of which I am now speaking, Lord CASTLEREAGH pointed out the danger which would arise from a change of Ministry on account of the *countenance* which *such change would give to the Radicals!*

But, alas! All these threats have lost their terrors. The Landlords have opened their eyes along with their purses. It is a strange thing, the influence which the purse has upon the eyes. While these gentlemen's purses were full, they were as blind as six-day puppies. Their purses having been emptied, their eyes have become open; and though their vision is as yet rather dim, they see clearer and clearer every day, and see already quite enough to convince them, that if they do not bestir themselves quickly they will be without house or home in a very short time.

To conjure up the bugbear of Radicals is, therefore, no longer of any use; and the Ministers must be astounded at perceiving that this grand apparition of all has lost its power to frighten. Perceiving this, they are at their wits end; they do not know



which way to turn themselves. They are frightened themselves in their turn, having now, as I long ago told them they would have, to deal with that against which SIX ACTS, Yeomanry Cavalry, Manchester Magistrates, and Parson HAY can afford them no assistance : their supporters ; nay, the elect of their supporters, are the very persons who must now necessarily be their assailants ; and if they themselves do not perceive this they must be blinder than moles, and more stupid than any living creature that ever has before been heard of.

However, it is pretty evident that they do see it all, or they would not have made those repeated promises, which resemble nothing but the repentance of school boys crouching under the rod, and the consequences of a fulfilment of those promises will be such as never have been experienced by any ministry before. An universal defection towards them and of them will take place ; and they will stand gaping just as a farmer would if his Ox were to refuse to work for him and his Ass were to decamp from the Crib. They will find themselves cramped in every movement, crippled in all their operations ;

they will experience loss of obedience to their will ; they will feel this every where, and particularly in *that place*, where, without obedience to their will, their power is gone and the machine comes to a stand. I have always said that it was foolish and even unprincipled, to call for *retrenchment*, to complain of wasteful expenditure ; and at the same time to oppose Reform, seeing that the Borough system cannot be sustained by any other means than those of that expenditure. Therefore, for the Ministers to keep their promises is to bring upon themselves the life of a dog, and to insure the destruction of the system after all.

On the other hand, if they break their promises, the consequence will be, an abandonment of them on the part of their friends. The Landlords will listen to no alarms about Radicals. They have already seen enough to convince them, that their real enemies are of a very different description, and, one of two things will happen, namely, the Ministers will be driven from their places at once, or if they remain in spite of the votes of the House of Commons, they will very soon be left with a treasury as empty as their own heads.

The mode of attack which the Landlords will adopt is merely that of *taking off taxes*; and, indeed, this is the true, constitutional mode of proceeding. They will not embarrass themselves much about estimates, with which indeed they have no business at all. It is not their affair to provide for any expences at all, until they have ascertained, whether the people have the means of contributing towards those expences. The business of a House of Commons is, first to redress grievances, and next, to grant or refuse money. Therefore, as to this latter, the first thing to be ascertained is, when they are asked for money, whether the people can *spare it*. And I believe, if the Landlords are to judge from their own circumstances, they will soon come to a conclusion, that the people cannot spare, in the whole, more than *about fifteen millions a year*.

The Landlords will, after they once set their hand to the plough, treat what is called the national debt with very little ceremony. The subject will have been so much canvassed before they meet again that it will be as familiar as any subjects relating to breakfasting or dining. Every servant girl will understand it, and will

laugh at the idea of that national honour and that public faith which are to strip English gentlemen of their estates and give them to jobbers and to jews.

It is impossible, as I have always said, to tell precisely how the thing will work; how it will wriggle itself along and bring itself to a close. But I think that one might, by consulting the stars a little, pretty nearly tell the fortune of the system. I will suppose you to represent it, and will now try my talent at divination, without your performing the accustomed ceremony of crossing my hand. Now open your's, Sir, and let me take hold of your fingers. Bless me, what crosses! What confusion! What ups and downs! What troubles! It is a fair palm, too. I can see all the branchings in it; all the cuttings in and out. Ah! Sir, this is a wicked world that you and I have to live in! One thing I can clearly see; and that is, that you are not destined to be a Minister this day three years; and upon that point I would stake my existence.

Not to develop all at once too much of my science, I shall proceed in the old humdrum way to describe what I think likely to happen. It is a grand and gross

error, which now a days I believe, remains in very few heads to suppose that "*retrenchment*," as it is called, can save the Landlords. But, this retrenchment will, I think, be pushed on, till salaries and pensions be reduced to the standard of 1797, upon the principle of having been granted or awarded in consequence of the *diminished value of money*. This is certainly beginning at the right end. Then I think it will be said to the Fund-Lords, "why are not you "to come down, too?" The thing is so reasonable, it is so manifestly just, that there is no gainsaying it with any shew of plausibility.

Nevertheless, there will be gainsaying enough. Men never give up what they call their property without a struggle; and though the struggle will be vain in the end, if the Landlords hold firm, a struggle there will be, unless the Bank stop payment again, and fresh bales of paper be poured out. This, however, would by no means tend to save the system, which must finally go to pieces on the rock of *low prices* or that of *two prices*. Before I proceed, therefore, with my fortune telling as to the struggle between landlords and fund-lords, let me say a

little upon what will take place, in case the Bank stop paying in cash; for this, well worthy of the attention of every one, is peculiarly worthy of *your* attention.

The Bill of Peel was a grand blunder; a shocking blunder; as fatal to the heroes of the system as was, to Napoleon, his marriage with the deadly Austrian. It was the shears of Delilah! Sorely has it been repented of! And even the Report of the Agricultural Committee, as good as says, that if the thing were to do *again*, it would not be done. However, to wade back is even worse than to go on. Payment has been begun, and though it is only *optional* with the bank, as far as the *law* goes; there exists a real compulsion, seeing that the Bank must now proceed upon pain of total discredit, and, indeed, a total *blowing up of the paper*. For, if the Bank were now to stop, with all this gold and silver afloat, there would instantly be *two prices*; a gold-price and a paper-price. This would knock up the system at once. The taxes would be paid in paper, and men would carry on their private dealings in gold and silver; for no man would ever again place faith in Bank-paper.

Therefore, the payments must

go on ; and the consequence will be (and even now is) that *no rents will come to the landlord*. For my part, speaking as to feeling, I by no means lament this ; and I feel much more for the man that was sent to prison (where he *now* is) for *four years and a half*, from the *Quarter Sessions* of Cheshire, in the year 1820. For this man, whose name I have forgotten, I have more respect than for any of those landlords, who, after having so long supported the system, are now sinking under it. This man's offences were *selling political pamphlets*. When he heard his sentence, he exclaimed : " is that *all* ! I thought you had a bit of *rope* for me ! " Here was a sentence of close imprisonment for more than half the average life of man turned of forty. Talk of *feeling*, then ! What feeling can we have, if we have no feeling for this man ?

However, if nobody else feel for the landlords, they will *feel for themselves* ; and, you may be assured, that they will *act* upon that feeling. It is, you will please to observe, utterly unavailing to attempt to relieve them by what is called "*retrenchment*." The Crib may be wholly emptied, and yet the estates of the landlords pass away. Besides, to

what extent can retrenchment go ? Can the Civil List be reduced more than one half ? As to the Army, Ordnance and Navy, discharging *the whole* of the *soldiers* and *sailors* would not produce a saving of four millions. And, then, where is the system ? It is the *Debt* that swallows, in the first place, *three fifths* of the taxes ; and it *causes* the demand for three fifths of the rest. All is nonsense, therefore, short of a reduction of the interest of the Debt ; and this is now seen by the landlords as clearly as it was by me many years ago.

But, notwithstanding this, there will be great difficulty in coming to the point. The fund-holders will set up a prodigious outcry, in which they will be aided by all the " respectable " and stock-jobbing part of the press. Some landlords are also fund-holders, and they will magnanimously shew their horror at any proposition for "*violating public faith*." The monied people are always the most active and most noisy ; and though the cause of the landlords, if they act fairly towards the people at large, is, and ever must be, the cause of the people, the " respectable " and stock-jobbing press, whose profits are in a great measure



dependent upon the paper-system, will give such a colour to the thing, that the people may, very probably, be on the side of the Fund-holders. The ministers, though they must necessarily wish to see prosperity restored, will unquestionably take the same side; because, whatever other effects a reduction of fund interest might, or might not, produce, it would produce their removal from office. It would, besides, give rise to a state of things, in which they would be as helpless as children.

Still the weight of the *landlords*, amongst whom the *Church* (the great landlord of all) is included, never will sink without a struggle. The Church has already lost half its revenue; and it is by no means come to its lowest mark. *Will it be quiet?* Yet, there are monstrous difficulties in the way of a reduction of interest; and I think it is clear, that the landlords, having the whole weight of the "*respectable* part" of the press" against them, will see the day, when they will call in vain, for the aid of poor little "*Twopenny Trash*," which they themselves assassinated, and over the mangled corpse of which they so much exulted.

The progress of this struggle

will be marked by a total *change of tone* in the landlords as well as in the government, towards the common people. We shall hear no more of the "*thunder of parliament*." Both will find themselves *poor*, and an empty purse is a wonderful teacher of modesty. None but very acute philosophers can tell *why* this is; but, certainly the purse and the tongue are very closely united. I much question whether we shall ever again hear the Reformers called a *low, degraded crew*; and whether, if *seat-selling* were again to become the subject of complaint, we should hear the complaint stigmatized as "*democratical encroachment*." Both sides will find, that they stand in need of *support*; and, after all, the *people*, the *great mass*, must be appealed to.

Now, Sir, it will be utterly impossible, that, during the struggle, it should not be made as clear as daylight, a thousand and a thousand times over, that, *if there had been a Reformed parliament*, those troubles and calamities never would have had an existence. Every evil, every danger, will, as clearly as the twig to the stem, be traced to the acts of the parliament; and, the conclusion, in every man's

mind, will be *that the parliament ought to be reformed*. In the meanwhile the discharge of persons from public employ; the reduction of salaries; the check given to the bestowing of pensions and the making of grants; the dispersion of swarms of tax-gatherers; the breaking up of banking establishments; the poverty of the large corner of the Crib allotted to brief-less lawyers: these and divers other things which will make their appearance, will remove the principal ground of attachment to the Borough-system. Therefore, nothing can be more natural than to suppose, that, as here is a sure way of gaining the millions to their side, the landlords will, at last, take this course; that is to say, that they will of *themselves propose a Reform of the Parliament*.

"Then," say you, "comes *'revolution!'*" Very true; and a *really* "glorious" one this time. Not a revolution which would affect the kingly office, except to make it truly great; not a revolution that would degrade the Nobility, but make them respected and beloved more even than at any former period. But, then comes everlasting night to the calumniators, the bitter per-

secutors, of the people. It will be *a revolution indeed* as to these! When we look only at the *two ends* of a progress, we can hardly believe our eyes. Show any one a beautiful India shawl, and afterwards a bunch of dirty rags. How is he struck upon being told that they are one and the same! But, let him see the shawl *during the whole of its progress*, and the result appears perfectly natural. It is thus with men. When they are brought down, they are seen during their progress from high to low; and, during the times that are at hand, we may expect to see some, who are now too lofty to be able to restrain their arrogance and insolence, singing their own ballads in the streets, without exciting surprise or commanding attention. It will be a mere question of verse and of voice; and, all but the singer himself will forget, or never have known, that he ever was any thing more than a singer of ballads.

You will say, that I express my *wishes* and not my *expectations*. I express both; and if the former are not to be left out of sight in estimating the latter, they are by no means to be regarded as proof of their fallaciousness: The best way for you is, to leave

*my wishes* out the question, and to look carefully at the *signs of the times*, and then say, whether my expectations be not warranted by these signs. If you do thus look; if you do observe what has recently been said and done on the subject of "*retrenchment*;" if you observe the altered tone of the Ministers, think of the cause of it, see the extent of their promises, and duly consider the consequences of their promises, whether fulfilled or broken; if you do these things, I am satisfied, that you will see no reason to laugh at my expectations, wild as they may, at first sight, appear to be.

To the Reformers a day of triumph is not far distant now. Indeed, they triumph *now*. I have always told them, that the *Debt* was their only sure friend; and, that as long as the paper-system should last, they would pray in vain. That system has received a rude stroke, under which it is now staggering along, and merely staggering. The next blow brings it to the ground, and then the genius of England will once more arise.

WM. COBBETT.

## LAWYER SCARLETT'S BILL.

It is *dead*! Seldom has earthly pilgrimage been more short, and never less pleasant. Parents should think a little before they bring unoffending innocents into the world to suffer; and, from what we have seen of late years, a law to *check the population* of beings of *this* description really seems to be demanded. This child of Lawyer Scarlett's genius has been singularly unhappy. However, "it is gone to a *better place*," though to trace it to its ultimate and obvious destination, might, perhaps, be deemed an uncharitable, or, at the least, an unsavoury office.

But there was something passed in the "Collective Wisdom" at the hour of the demise of this Bill, of which, in order to avoid a charge of unfairness, I shall give an account by inserting the whole of the Report from the paper of my friend, Mr. PERRY; and, when I have done that, I shall, perhaps, out of my feeling for the parent of the hapless deceased, be tempted to give it a few farewell remarks.

The reader will please to bear in mind, that this bill had undergone two regular discussions,

and had been read twice; that it then stood for *commitment*; that, in the meanwhile, several petitions had been presented relative to it, and that there had been a discussion, short or long, upon all these occasions. Finally the bill stood for commitment, and was then to be debated at full length. The debate began and went on for some time, and, for want of further time, was *adjourned*. Now, who ever before heard of an *adjourned debate* not being resumed at the *next* meeting of the House? This stood adjourned for *more than a fortnight*; and, at last, on *Monday night*, the order for resuming the debate was *discharged*; that is to say, the debate was *not resumed at all!* Whatever else this might show signs of, it certainly showed no signs of eagerness to have the measure *discussed*.—I shall now insert the report, pointing out by *italicks* parts to which I wish to draw more particularly the reader's attention.

MR. SCARLETT rose, not, he said, at the close of the Session, to press any discussion on the Bill; indeed, from the outset, *he did not express a hope* that the Bill would be carried through the House that Session. He would not enter at present into any discussion whatever, but would reserve himself for a further opportunity to answer

the arguments that had been urged against the Bill. It would, in particular, be necessary for him to brush up his law, in order to meet the opposition of his Honourable and Gallant Friend (Sir R. Wilson). Whether they should meet in private contest or otherwise, he hoped his Honourable and Gallant Friend would not prove more fortunate than he ought to be.—He (Mr. S.) was aware that *much had been written in order to inflame the public mind on this subject*; for himself, he would say, that his attention had been directed to the state of the Poor Laws for the last 30 years, and he always was of opinion that they were laws most injurious to the community, and most oppressive to the poor. He thought they were laws which went to degrade the lower classes. He *withdrew* the Bill for the present, but he proposed *next Session to renew the measure*. He would not pledge himself to words, but, in principle, it would be substantially the same. If he should meet the same sort of support which he had received, he would propose another Bill for greater discrimination between the moral claims of persons seeking for relief, and for the purpose of checking the expenditure, which was now a subject of general complaint. He should also propose, *that the fathers of families should be no longer balloted for the Militia, but that single men should be compelled to serve*.

SIR R. WILSON said, that when the measure should be brought forward he would oppose it every inch. In order to qualify himself to meet the threatened contest with his Honourable and Learned Friend, he would sit



down to study black letter during the summer [a laugh].

Mr. H. GURNEY said, he hoped the Honourable and Learned Gentleman would duly consider the state of the Poor Laws before he attempted to interfere with them. He could not help thinking that the principle of the Bill *was absurd and injurious*. The object of the Bill was to *prevent marriages*; it went on the *vicious principle laid down by Mr. Malthus*, a principle which was against the laws of nature, and which, if acted on, would not leave an Englishman to till the ground which maintained his forefathers. He hoped that the House *would not be insulted by any of Mr. Malthus's friends attempting to force upon them the adoption of his system*. A violent attempt to subvert the Poor Laws *was more worthy a raving madman than a Legislator*.

Dr. LUSHINGTON said, that if he thought the Bill went to interfere with the real comforts of the poor, he would not give it his support, but he looked upon the Bill as a measure likely to remove the causes of their degradation, and to promote their real independence. The Hon. Member had said that the Bill was a measure to prevent marriages; it was no such thing, it was a Bill to take away undue encouragement to improvident marriages.

Mr. F. PALMER rose, when

Mr. SCARLETT said, that he had avoided all argument on the measure, and he thought it *unfair*, after he had waived his right, for Honourable Gentlemen to open a debate and to *misrepresent the principles and objects of the Bill*. He might be assimilated

to a madman, but the Honourable Gentleman himself was an abhorrer, and an abhorrer could not reason.

Mr. GURNEY assured the Hon. and Learned Gentleman that he did not mean to betray, even in appearance, a want of courtesy to him.

Mr. T. COURTENAY said, he had been amongst the opponents of the Bill, but if any thing would have induced him to be *ashamed of his conviction*, it would be *the praises which had been bestowed on those who had taken the same course as himself*. He hoped the Honourable and Learned Gentleman would bring in a Bill next Session on the principle of modification and limitation, instead of abolition.

Mr. HARBORD said the House seemed too much disposed to hear every thing on one side, viz. in praise of the Bill. Though he was not disposed to urge arguments against a measure which had been withdrawn, he should say that he disapproved of the principle of it, though he was disposed to thank the Honourable and Learned Gentleman for having called their attentions to what was certainly a subject of great importance.

Mr. F. PALMER considered the Poor Laws as the chartered rights of the poor, and hoped the House would pause before it consented to touch them, and inquire seriously into the condition of the labouring classes. He was persuaded there was not a single Member who was acquainted with the wages and outgoings of a labouring man, so as to be able to know whether, if in full work, he would be able to support a family. At the end of the last Session he had

obtained an account of 300 poor families from a friend of his, who had employed himself in obtaining them, and the wages were then not enough to support a family. He had himself laboured during the last six weeks to obtain information on the same subject, and he hoped the House would take no step without the fullest inquiry.

Mr. MONCK said he felt it was necessary to take some step on the subject of the Poor Laws, and he would go so far as to say that he should be satisfied with nothing but their total, though gradual abolition. But before he consented to such a measure, he should deem it necessary to demand in the name of the people, the redress of several grievances, which it was not necessary for him now to detail, but he particularly alluded to the Corn Law.

Mr. SCARLETT said, it was necessary to state that he had never proposed to go so far as to deny provision to the infirm and aged indigent poor. His feelings were in favour of such a provision, though there were *strong authorities*, and he would mention one of a person who would not be considered by the Honourable Gentleman (Mr. H. Gurney) a *raving madman*; a term which he supposed the Honourable Gentleman had applied, not to him (Mr. S.) personally, but to all who differed from the Hon. Gentleman in opinion on the subject of the Poor Laws. The authority to which he referred was that of *Dr. Franklin*, who said, that in those countries in which the greatest public provision was made for the poor, they were in the worst condition, and in those countries where

least provision was made for them, they were in the best condition. In reply to the observation of the Honourable Member for Reading (Mr. F. Palmer), he observed, that the Poor Rates kept down the wages of labour, and that at the present moment, in many of the agricultural counties, when from the rise in the value of money, the wages heretofore paid would have been sufficient to support a family, instead of the poor's rates having been reduced, wages had been reduced, the subsistence of the labourer being still supplied in the degrading shape of alms. This system would go on till it was checked by some such measure as he had proposed. *As to popularity*, though he wished to obtain it, he would not purchase it by sacrificing the interests of the country, and he hoped it would not be said of any legislator as of a comic Poet—

After this followed some *Latin* (or, at least, I suppose it was), which, I dare say, the reader would hardly think worth the room that would be required for its insertion.

The public will, I fancy, concur perfectly with Mr. GURNEY, which, however, must be regarded as a misfortune by that gentleman, if he should happen to be of the same taste as Mr. COURTENAY, who, if Mr. Perry have fairly reported him, is "*ashamed*" of his conviction," on account of his having, with others, been *praised* for his opposition to the

bill. Bless us! We have got an extremely fastidious law-giver in the person of Mr. T. COURTENAY. He would "do good by stealth," and he "blushes to find it fame." But, is this rare person, T. Courtenay, or P. Courtenay; or is it T. P. or P. T.? Or, *who* is he, or *what* is he, or is there two or more of them? For I see the changes rung upon these letters put before the name of Courtenay. Is it the same person that was (and, I suppose, is) a distinguished member of that famous Royal Commission, who have been rather better than two years and a quarter seeking for an *inimitable note* as anxiously as Glory has been *seeking for a public*, and who imported a company of Yankees to furnish the "Mother Country" with money? Waiting to know *who* this our modest gentleman is, I now come to a personage who has not that sin to answer for at any rate, namely, *Lawyer Scarlett*.

The Lawyer began by saying, that he *never had hoped* to carry the bill *this session*; but, that he would bring it on *next session*. In the meanwhile *this bill* is dead. If he bring in a bill it must be another bill; and the next bill, too, is, it appears, to be a very

different sort of bill from this. So that this bill, let it be understood, is dead as a door nail.

The Lawyer said, that he "*was aware that much had been written in order to inflame the public mind on this subject.*" Who has written it? I know of nobody but myself that has reprobated the Bill "out of doors." To be sure I have written much about this Bill; but nothing to *inflame*; except facts and arguments are inflammable; and if facts and arguments be such as to inflame the public mind, the public mind *ought* to be inflamed. To deny this is to take from words a great part of their use, which, I suppose, is hardly to be done out of mere complaisance to Lawyer SCARLETT. I was particularly careful in my onset upon this Bill, in my letter to Mr. HAYES, to take no unfair advantage of the Lawyer. I did not set out with any hypocritical professions of candour, and of personal respect for the author of the Bill. I began by saying in so many words, "I hate Lawyer SCARLETT, mind; therefore, let the reader be upon his guard, and, in this case, believe nothing upon my assertion or my opinion." Nothing could be fairer than this. It was giving to the man I hated

every possible advantage. Therefore, if I inflame the public mind, how bad must his measure have been!

Besides it was not from without, but from within, that the Lawyer met with the loudest opposition; and *there* my attacks on the Bill was the very thing that he ought to have desired; for, I believe most sincerely, that *my* opposition to the measure would be a reason for supporting it with forty against one of that assembly. This has been conspicuous upon numerous occasions; and of this fact the public are very well convinced. My opposition was the very thing of all others, that was calculated to serve him. Does he think, too, that I did not know this? I knew it very well; but, in the first place it was my duty to show the evils of the measure. The injustice, the cruelty, the gross absurdity of it. In the next place I had a right, and, perhaps, it was a duty also, to show that I understood the subject, important as it was in itself and in its consequences, and connected as every such measure must be, with the happiness and with the permanent power of the kingdom. I had moreover a right, if I chose to exercise it, to show my superiority over Lawyer SCARLETT,

and whether I should choose to exercise it or not, was a point referable solely to my own feelings. Having accomplished these purposes, I cared very little about the decision of the "Great Council of the Nation." The truth is, and I will not disguise it, that I wished the Bill to pass, just as it was brought in in the first place; just as the Lawyer's thirty years study of the poor laws had produced it, in his mind; for I well knew that it would not live a year, and that it would raise a hurricane through the country, such as we have never seen in our day.

Therefore, the Lawyer has really derived benefit, as far as relates to the chance of passing his bill from every thing that I have written against it. I am very well aware of all the feelings that are at work in that assembly with regard to me and my writings. I have not mock modesty enough to pretend not to perceive the power that I have in the country, and it is out of the power of that assembly to disguise from me, that they are well aware of the extent of that power. Neither am I ignorant of the power that I have with regard to their actions, and of the great reluctance that they have to suffer or the public to per-



ceive that they feel the effects of any such power. I manage my matters adroitly; but the power I have, and the power I will have; and this I repeat it, the public know full as well as I do; and I only state the facts here, in order to let those who grudge me the power know that the possession of it gives me great satisfaction.

The Lawyer is reported to have said, that, in his next Bill "*he should propose, that the Fathers of families should no longer be ballotted for the militia.*" These are the words literally taken from the Morning Chronicle. Never was any thing more unjust than this in itself; but, how monstrous to be proposed by the man, who has brought in a bill, one of the objects of which is to *prevent hasty and improvident marriages!* Here, in this new proposition is a premium for marriage; an exemption of the most valuable kind; during the last war many men cut off their thumb or their finger, or otherwise mutilated themselves to set aside the claim of the militia law upon them.— This is a notorious fact. And will they not then marry to effect the same purpose? Let a war come, offer this premium for ma-

trimony, and the Parsons and Clerks must work night and day. To get a substitute demanded upon an average about 15 pounds. A wife is a great deal cheaper, and she would be an exemption for ever. This, however, is something too monstrous even to have come into the head of Lawyer SCARLETT. At any rate if there be an error in the report, I point out the necessity of correcting it, and of showing the world that the lawyer did not go to this outrageous length of absurdity. The Lawyer observed that there were strong authorities for going even farther than he had proposed to go, even so far as to deny provision to the infirm and indigent poor. One of these authorities was, he said, not a *raving madman* at any rate, being no less a person than Dr. FRANKLIN. He then proceeds to say that Dr. Franklin had said, "that in those countries in which the greatest public provision was made for the poor, they were in the worst condition; and that in those countries where the least public provision was made for them, they were in the best condition."

Now, Dr. Franklin, though a very shrewd and very cunning man, and though he has been

called a great philosopher also, had not all the wisdom in the world. Great numbers of his maxims are trivial if not childish; a still greater number of them are false; the whole tenor of them tends to evil; for it constantly aims at strengthening selfishness and at enfeebling generosity. However, the Doctor being a *strong* authority with our Lawyer SCARLETT, it is advisable to overthrow the strong man, which, to begin with we will do in the Doctor's own words, of which we are reminded by a great deal stronger authority, our own countryman Mr. PAINE. The Doctor, in his rambles went from England to Ireland; England where the greatest public provision is made for the poor, and Ireland where the least public provision is made for the poor. And what did it occur to the *strong authority* to observe, as to the state of the people of the two countries? Why this; "that the two people were in so different a state, the English so much better off than the Irish, that the labourers of the latter country *seemed to be dressed in, or rather covered with the cast off cloathes of the labourers of the former country!*"

This might suffice in the way of demolishing the Lawyer's *strong* authority. But, besides this, if the Doctor had been of Lawyer SCARLETT's way of thinking, how comes it that he never prevailed with any part of the United States of America to adopt laws according with his maxim? The Doctor had great influence in those states. He had a great deal of knowledge; great experience; he was a long headed man; possessed a great deal of real wisdom, and had credit for ten times as much as he possessed. How comes it, then, that he never even proposed to make the slightest alteration in the act of Queen Elizabeth, which from their earliest settlement to the present day, has been in force in all the American States? This is a very strong presumption, not only against the Doctor's authority in this respect, but against the fashionable outcry now raised against that celebrated and most justly venerated Statute of the wisest Sovereign (the present always excepted!) that ever sat upon the throne of this Kingdom. There was a time when the English Statutes were not very popular on the other side of the Atlantic. There was a sort of merit at that time in being

forward to decry those Statutes. They were all annulled down to a certain period. Selections were made from the rest. In short there was an eagerness, a splotic haste to sweep as much of them away as possible. Yet it never occurred to any one to propose any thing having the smallest tendency to infringe upon or weaken the effect of this great, this just, this benevolent, this righteous and renowned law. To do this thing was reserved for men like Lawyer SCARLETT; to him, therefore, let the honour exclusively belong!

---

TO MR. BIRKBECK.

---

*Kensington, 4. July, 1821.*

SIR,

I read in the Morning Chronicle of the 20th of last month, something purporting to be an extract of a letter from you, dated on the 21st of January last at Wansburg in the Illinois, and addressed to a friend in Yorkshire. In this extract you make mention of me in a way that I by no means merit at your hands; but, which is of a great deal more consequence, denying the truth of those statements of mine, which, as you acknowledge, have

deterred many people from joining you in your new Colony.

I have called upon the person, styling himself your friend in Yorkshire, and who, as the publication purports, sent the extract to our inscrutable Scotchman for publication; I have called upon this friend of yours publicly, not to hang back; not to fight in the dark; not to circulate slander and delusion under your name, without giving us his own name, and vouching, as he ought, for the authenticity of the extract in question. But, I have called in vain, which, give me leave to say, does very little credit either to himself or his correspondent.

It is possible that the publication of this extract may have been unauthorised by you; but published it is, and, under all the circumstances of the case, I am, I think, fully warranted in considering you to be the writer. I will, therefore, now, not do as you have done by me; but will act fairly by you. I will give all the publicity I can to this extract; and, then, I will show that the assertions it contains upon myself are wholly unfounded; and further, which is of infinitely more importance, that it is calculated to prolong that de-

lusion, to which so many of our countrymen have already fallen victims.

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Morris Birkbeck, dated Wansburg,<sup>3</sup> Illinois, America, to a friend in Yorkshire, dated Jan. 21, 1821:—

“ . . . . The favourable *prognostics* which induced me to select this place for a settlement are confirmed, and even exceeded by the *test of experience*. *Calumny* has lost its sting, and *envy ceases to be a torment* to any but its possessors. So the burden is loosed from my shoulders, and I may, perhaps, be favoured to step along more lightly, through the remainder of my pilgrimage. . . .

“ Here, as in England, *capital is required for farming*; the great difference consists in the *security of profit in the annual returns*, and in the *accumulation of capital* from our improvements on our *own property*. I need not describe to you the circumstances in the condition of the British farmer which produce the contrast.

“ I suppose you have seen *Cobbett's attack on me*, and laughed at the ridiculous posture in which he has contrived to place me. My Reply you may not have heard of; it was published by Ridgway, and if it has *not fallen in your way*, you may perhaps wish to see how *little of truth* there is in his statements and description of our proceedings. Although *he is known to be wholly indifferent to truth*, there is a spirit in his drawings which makes them *pass for likenesses*, in defiance of our judgment. I understand many people have been deterred from joining us by *Cobbett's Letter*. I regret

it for their sakes, as I have *not seen or heard of a spot in America so well suited to English settlers as this*. If I had now to choose, I should fix on this very place.”

Pray, Sir, by what rule known amongst men, are you justified in imputing to me an *attack* upon you? What do you call an *attack*? I addressed two letters to you, while I was in Long Island, dated in the latter part of the year 1818, which I presume you allude to when you speak of “*Cobbett's letter*.” Now, throughout the whole of those letters there is not to be found one single expression to warrant this charge of having made an “*attack*” upon you. From one end to the other I speak of you with the greatest respect; I express my pride at claiming you for my countryman. I begin thus, “I have read your “two little books. I opened “them, and I proceeded in the “perusal, with fear and trembling; not because I supposed it “possible for you to put forth an “intended imposition on the “world; but, because I had a “sincere respect for the character “and talents of the writer; and “because I knew how enchanting “and delusive are the prospects “of enthusiastic minds, when “bent on grand territorial acqui-



“sitions. My apprehensions were,  
 “I am sorry to have it to say,  
 “but too well founded. Your  
 “books, written, I am sure,  
 “without any intention to deceive  
 “and decoy, and without any the  
 “smallest tincture of base self-  
 “interest, are, in my opinion,  
 “calculated to produce great dis-  
 “appointment, not to say misery  
 “and ruin, amongst our own  
 “country people (for I will, in  
 “spite of your disavowal, still  
 “claim the honour of having you  
 “for a countryman); and great  
 “injury to America by sending  
 “back to Europe accounts of that  
 “disappointment, misery and  
 “ruin.”

This, Sir, was the beginning  
 of the “*attack*.” In this strain  
 I went through the whole of my  
 commentary; never in one single  
 instance making use of a rude or  
 disrespectful expression as applied  
 to you. And how did I finish  
 the “*attack*?” It was thus: “in  
 “the meanwhile, let us enjoy  
 “ourselves here, amongst this  
 “kind and hospitable people;  
 “but, let us never forget, that  
 “England is our Country, and  
 “that her freedom and renown  
 “ought to be as dear to us as the  
 “blood in our veins. God bless  
 “you and give you health and  
 “happiness.”

And this is what you call an  
 “*attack*” on you! This is what  
 you call *calumny*, and represent  
 as a mark of *envy*! I am sin-  
 cerely sorry to witness this ebul-  
 lition of mortification; this wasp-  
 ish species of resentment in you,  
 for whom I have always had,  
 since I first knew you, a very  
 great respect, and to animadvert  
 publicly upon whose projects  
 gave me unaffected pain, and  
 could not possibly have proceeded  
 from any other motive than that  
 of a sense of duty. However,  
 as some compensation for the loss  
 of your friendship, I perceive,  
 even in this angry extract, a  
 proof that that duty was not per-  
 formed in vain.

Now, Sir, as to the manner of  
 the “*attack*,” with respect to  
 place. It was not behind your  
 back. It was not written to be  
 circulated in Europe, so that you  
 might have no chance of answer-  
 ing till it had produced its effects.  
 It was written in America. It  
 was almost instantly published at  
 New York; and I remained in  
 Long Island for nearly a twelve-  
 month afterwards. Your publi-  
 cations as well as mine were be-  
 fore the people of America.  
 Common prudence must have  
 prevented me from making state-  
 ments which could be instantly

contradicted; and, upon which point I shall not be very jealous. supposing me to possess very little prudence in general, some caution I must have had, on an occasion, when, according to your insinuation, my intention was to deceive and mislead.

In the excess of your charity, you are kind enough to observe, that I am "*known* to be wholly "*indifferent to truth.*" Yet, you say, that there is a spirit in my drawings, that make them *pass for likenesses* in defiance of people's judgment. There is here pretty nearly a contradiction in terms; for, if I am *known* to be wholly indifferent to truth, those must be destitute of judgment indeed who will take my drawings for likenesses upon my bare word. Those who read the letters in *England*, might, however, possibly be mislead by what you call the spirit of the drawings; but, unhappily for this reason of yours, the letters were first published in *America*; where I must have known it to be impossible to deceive the public, sensible and sharp sighted as it is by any drawings that I could exhibit.

However, it does appear (though awkwardly enough) that "*many people* have been de-

terred from joining us by Cobbett's letter." What, Sir! Many people, who had read your books, and had viewed the Elysian fields therein described; *many people* deterred from joining you; *many people* influenced, guided, determined in this most important concern to themselves and families; *many people* to be thus diverted from the pursuit of what you told them was blessedness indescribable; many people to be thus turned aside, to be thus induced to give up cherished hopes excited by you; and all this, upon the bare word of a man, "**KNOWN** to be wholly "*indifferent to truth.*"

The truth is, Sir, that a knowledge of me, precisely the opposite of that which you have been pleased to describe as existing in the public mind, produced the effect, which has excited your anger, made you lose your temper, and along with it, your justice and good manners. I know that it has been stated, in letters from the Illinois, that I myself had a concern in land speculations elsewhere; and that, therefore, I endeavoured to decry your colony. In the winter and during the spring and summer of 1819, I was visited by Doctor Rose of the Susquehuama set-

tlement, and by Mr. Lewis, formerly of New York, who has also a new settlement in hand. These gentlemen submitted their plans to me, or, at least, laid them before me, doubtless with a desire that I should, if I thought it right, recommend their settlements respectively. My reputation for knowledge respecting such matters, and also the influence of my writings, if directed to such an object, made it very natural that those gentlemen should propose to me to be associated in some degree in their respective concerns. But those gentlemen will do me the justice to say, that I frankly told them not only that I could think of no such thing for myself; but, that, being convinced, that English Farmers, nine times out of ten suffered injury from emigration, and especially to new settlements, I should think it a very base act on my part to do any thing tending to promote such emigration. I know they will do me the justice to say this; and I will do them the justice to say that they both approved of my resolution; and that neither of them made the smallest effort to divert me from my purpose. I will add, too, of both these gentlemen, that they attempted no

exaggerations, drew no flowery pictures, disguised none of the difficulties; but, like sensible and honest men, were endeavouring to give value to their property by fair and honourable means.

The invention of this false imputation; the resorting to the imputation of such a motive to me, clearly shows the weight of the circumstance of the absence of *sinister motive*! For, if no such motive were suspected, my letters could not fail to produce great effect. In short, I could have no motive other than the professed one. It was my right, having great influence, to exercise it for the good of my unfortunate countrymen; for, *unfortunate* that man is, who, from whatever cause, is *compelled* to quit his native country.

Besides, Sir, I dealt, not in *drawings*, but in *facts*. I took facts, stated by yourself, and proved them to be untrue; I took your calculations, and proved them to be delusive. It would be useless to go over the ground again, but I will just advert, for a moment to the *grand delusion*.

You reckon your own crop produces the first year 2,000 bushels of Indian corn, grown upon a hundred acres of land.

	Bush. I. Corn.	B. Wheat.
First - -	2,000 - - -	—
Second - -	2,000 - - -	1,500
Third - -	4,000 - - -	1,500
Fourth - -	4,000 - - -	3,000
	—	—
	12,000	6,000

Good God! I showed the delusion of all this. I showed the wildness of it. And what was the fact? Why, the *first* year, as is stated in the Journal of Mr. HULME, who visited you in July, and whose account clearly shews a strong disposition to say all the good he could say of your undertaking, you had *not a single ear* of Indian Corn! Who, then, was it that was "*wholly indiffer-  
rent to truth?*" But, Sir, here we have, in the course of four years, *twelve thousand bushels of Indian corn*, and *six thousand bushels of wheat*. Mr. JUDGE LAURENCE, at Bayside, Queen's County, Long Island, has a farm, which contains a hundred and thirty acres. It is as good as can be; and, I imagine, that it takes him about *twenty years* to raise what you were to raise in four, though his farm has been enclosed for a *century*, is situated most advantageously, and is in as able hands as any in the country.

However, before you can possibly see this Letter, *your third crop will be in*. According to the

calculation which you made, and upon the strength of which you called your English farmers to join you, the three crops ought to amount to *eight thousand bushels of Indian Corn* and *three thousand bushels of wheat*. Now, then, I put you to the test. I challenge you to *publish an account of your three crops*. I am of opinion, that they do not amount to *two thousand bushels of corn* and *one thousand of wheat*. Nay, I should not be afraid to bet, that they do not reach more than the *half* of even that amount! This is coming to the point. You will *not publish*, I am satisfied; but, then, shall I say that you are "*wholly indifferent to truth?*" I will not say that; but I will say, that you are a man much too sanguine and too enthusiastic to be relied upon by persons, who are to venture all their property, with their lives into the bargain, in becoming your followers.

Let me now observe upon an expression or two that has slipped out of this extract, relative to your prospects of January last. You say, that your *prognostics* have been *confirmed*. Then, *had* you, in January last, the *four thousand bushels of Corn* and the *one thousand five hundred bushels of wheat*, which you prog-



nosticated you should have at the end of the second harvest? If you be not "wholly indifferent to truth," you will answer this question in a distinct manner.

You say, that "*capital is required for farming*" in the Illinois as well as in England; but, that the great difference consists in the *security of profit in the annual returns*, and in the *accumulation of capital* from our improvements on our own property. Now, though this latter part, *security of profit*, and *accumulation of profit*, is true in words, it is wholly delusive in meaning, when *addressed to English farmer*, whose ideas of profit and accumulation are altogether different from those of the American farmer. The plain and fair and true state of the case is this: that, the profits of farming in America are *nothing*, if the labour is to be *hired*. If a man have a farm of his *own*, owe no *money on it*, till it with skill and economy, he will, doubtless, get from it *the amount of the interest of the money that the farm is worth*; but, unless he, or his family, or both, actually labour themselves, he will *get nothing more from the farm*. This is the state of the case; and, deny it in the face of the people of America, if you can.

You still persist, that you have chosen the *best spot for English Settlers*, though so many have had to *rue* the hour they listened to your fatal advice. I might, indeed, easily discover *more than one motive* for this pertinacity; but, I refrain. Having discharged my duty; having saved many from ruin, I find, in that, a sufficient compensation for my trouble and for the *real attacks*, which you and Mr. George Flower have thought proper to make upon me.

But, as to *English Farmers*, yours, or any like yours, is the *very worst spot* they can go to. I am told, that Mr. *William Hunt* took out *two thousand pounds*. If ever there was an Englishman formed for your spot he was the man. Health, strength, and activity all met in him in an *extraordinary degree*. He was, too, *sober, well skilled in husbandry, industrious and vigilant*. With great sorrow I heard of his untimely end from one of those terrible fevers that never fail to haunt new settlements for years. One of Mr. *Flower's sons is dead also*, in the bloom of life.

Now, if Mr. Flower had followed my advice, given him at New York; if he had purchased a farm or two on the

Atlantic side, this son would, in all probability, have been alive; the family would have been settled amongst, and, worthy as they are, would have been highly respected by, a charming society of intelligent and hospitable neighbours, instead of being, in the first place *driven back* (as Mr. George Flower was on his arrival) *from the door of your cabin*, and afterwards doomed for their lives (unless they retreat in time) to pass their days principally amongst the fellers of trees and the swallows of whiskey.

Poor William Hunt wrote home (a letter published in the newspapers) that there were no *game laws* there. Very true. Nor are there any game laws in the Province of New Brunswick, where I, being at a loyalist Yankee's on the banks of a "*Creek*" called the *Oromucto*, which runs into the *Saint John*, have knocked down scores of pheasants (called Spruce Partridges) with a stick; have seen the farmer catch three hundred pigeons at one spring of the

net; and have seen him fling cart-loads of beautiful salmon out of the Creek as manure for his little bit of natural meadow; while the high-lands, all around, for miles and miles, were either red with the fruit of the raspberry or blue with that of the huckleberry. Did we *eat* pheasants, pigeons, salmon, raspberries or huckleberries, think you? Very little indeed; and, as for setting a *value* on them, or on the pursuit of the animals or fish, it is nonsense to think of such a thing. A *cloying* takes place the second day, like the appetite for plumbs in a boy bound apprentice to a grocer.

Had Mr. William Hunt come to me, instead of going to you, he would have been the owner of a beautiful farm in Long Island, *living well, riding a good horse*, and passing a pleasant life. There, too, there is a little *spice of game-laws*. The act of King William (punishment of *trespass after warning*) is in force; and the State-Laws forbid shooting

or killing *out of season*. There, we see sporting; dogs are kept for the purpose; and, in short, the pursuit has a certain value set upon it. These, therefore, are the parts of America for English farmers to go to, if go they will, and they will, to a certainty, rather than expend their last shilling upon the Fundholders.

Before I conclude I must notice another very striking instance of the disagreeable effects of your enthusiastic turn of mind. In your *Notes* you charmed many persons with the answer which you said you had given to a *priest*, who had offered you his services, on the supposition that your new colony might stand in need of ghostly assistance. You answer, that you find that the trees and grass and every thing have thriven very well for countless ages without any priest; and that you do not perceive that one can now be at all necessary. You also relate the manner of *burials*, and observe, with evident exultation, that, on such occasions, *reli-*

*gion* makes no part of the ceremonial. Now, what was the consequence. A hurricane rising against you, stirred up by priests of *all denominations*, from one end of the Union to the other. And, what part did you act, in order to shelter yourself from this hurricane? Why, write and cause to be published an *apology*, and cite, as a proof of your respect for *religion*, the fact, that "this very day my team is employed in drawing logs to build a Meeting House!"

Rather than have done this, I would have chopped off, with my other hand, the hand with which the letter was written. But, I would not have done this. I would have left my colony to the squatters and the bears; would have come back to *Old Wansborough*; have resumed my husbandry there; would have paid my *tithes* cheerfully; and, would have frankly acknowledged that I had been disappointed. But, I never would have committed the original error. I never would have given

such an affront to *general opinion*. Bred a Quaker, as you were, you might have suffered others to pay priests, and have jogged on quietly, laughing, in your sleeve, at their folly.

In conclusion, I beg you, your Yorkshire friend, Mr. Perry, and the public to bear in mind, that, if you have failed in your speculations, the fault is not mine; that, before you embarked, I, who had had more experience as

to such matters than you have even now, warned you of the dangers; and that I am by no means bound to keep silence, lest you should suffer by my speaking.

Wishing you, as I always sincerely have, health and happiness, and every enjoyment not derived from injury done to others, I remain,

Your most obedient Servant,

WM. COBBETT



### Napoleon is DEAD!!!!!!

The COURIER says he died on Saturday, the 5th of May, 1821, " of a LINGERING ILLNESS, " which confined him to his bed " upwards of FORTY DAYS ; " that he desired, that, after his " death, his body should be " opened, as HE suspected, that " he was dying of the SAME " DISEASE WHICH HAD " KILLED HIS FATHER!!!" Not another word will I say upon this subject.

### BREWING.

I, some time ago, intimated my intention of publishing an account of the result of an experiment I was about to make in *brewing for a family*. I have made the experiment, which has perfectly satisfied me, that any one may make *stronger* beer for *sixpence a gallon* than can be purchased of brewers for *sixpence a quart* ; and that excellent table beer can be brewed for *four pence a gallon*. But, to do justice to this matter ; to give a good heavy souse to the pot-house and the tea-kettle, I must have more space than the Register (without

excluding other matter) will give me ; and yet, SIX ACTS are a bar in my way ; for, they will not allow me to publish any thing in numbers at less than *sixpence*, unless I do it *once a month* and *no oftener*. I have managed Six-Acts pretty well ; and I shall now manage them in this way. I shall publish *monthly*, four or five, perhaps it may go to *six*, *Numbers*, which will form a little work, intended for the use of industrious, and especially, *labouring families* ; and this work is to be entitled, " COTTAGE ECONOMY."

Six-Acts have a particular attachment to the two days which end one month and begin another. This may be thought whimsical ; but, Six-Acts is a gentleman that " *thunders*," and, therefore, we have nothing to do but submit. I shall, then, on the *First of August* publish the *First Number* of this little work, in the course of which I shall treat of *Brewing*, *Baking*, *Cows*, *Pigs*, *Poultry* and *Bees* ; of the raising of food for *Cows* and *Pigs* ; and, in short, of all things that occur to me that I think it useful to treat of in a work intended to prevent that misery, which is brought upon labouring families by the pot-house and the tea-kettle.

### A CHALLENGE

*To the two Universities and all  
the Parsons.*

Five of Cobbett's *Monthly Sermons*, (Price 3d.) have been published, and nearly *forty thousand Sermons have been sold*. Now, I hereby challenge the above bodies and individuals to show, that any *hundred sermons*, published by members of their cloth, ever had a sale to the same number. Besides this, the *Sermons*, when printed in a first edition, are *Stereotyped*, so that *new editions* (and many have been printed) are struck off at any time; and, there requires no heavy stock on hand to keep the demand supplied, and to enable readers to complete their sets at any time.—When 12 *Sermons* are out, there will be a neat little volume.—We already beat the "*Tract Society*" out of the water; and, it must mend its hand, or people will not take their pamphlets even at a gift, except for purposes which it would hardly be decent to describe. The nation has to thank *Six-Acts* for this publication. The spirit was in motion: it was working within: and, feeling itself checked,

in its former channel, by *Six-Acts*, it broke out in this new manner.

Just Published, price 4s.

**STOCK EXCHANGE.** The error of tolerating this as an Enclosed Market in Contumacy of the Statute Law. Its Interest described and shewn to be adverse to the Capitalist and Stockholder, and to have caused the ruin or secession of all the Loan Contractors, from Boyd to Goldsmidt, to the aggrandisement of Stock Exchange Milords: the extraordinary Profit and Advantage that would ensue to the Banker, Stockholder, and Sinking Fund, by breaking the daily purchases for that Fund, as also for the Saving Banks publicly in the Rotunda of the Bank, instead of as hitherto in the inclosed Stock Exchange. Stock Exchange Hoaxes superior to the Simple Cochrane Experiment as shewn in the Stock Exchange Telegraph. The Old Palace-yard Pop Gun Plot, the 4th May; and the ruins of Buckwood's Banking-house, with the Settling day described; and the Ticket Pocketing Trick to accomplish the Stock Exchange Bear Account against the Public Bull; the Banker's Clearing House, as a financial operation shewn; the Error of the Restriction Bill is not participated in the immense profit it levied to the Bank from the Public—and the greater error in Lord Castle-reagh not superseding it by a Treaty of Commerce; Lotteries, with a Tax submitted on Time Bargains to supersede them; produces Gobling and the iniquitous Lock up Scheme, with the Pall-mall R—l connection; the disproportionate Positions of Indoor Jobber Broker and Capitalists; with the Evils of Stock Exchange Gambling in anecdotes of Peers Bankers, Bank Defaulters, &c. &c. &c.

By Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange; and may be had of the Booksellers.

Just Published, by W. Clark, 201, Strand, opposite St. Clement's Church,

**A**N hitherto suppressed Poem, by Lord Byron, entitled *WALTZ*, elegantly printed in 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.

2. **KILLING NO MURDER**, written by **COLONEL TITUS** during the Protectorship of **OLIVER CROMWELL**, who is said by different historians to have **NEVER SMILED** after the publication of it. Printed in 4to. from the original, without any alteration in orthography or punctuation, price 2s. 6d.

3. **REFLECTIONS** on the **LIFE** and **DEATH** of **LORD CLIVE**, by **Mr. THOMAS PAINE**. This piece, which is a specimen of beautiful writing, never appeared in this country till **Mr. Clark**, who brought it from the United States, published it.—Price 3d.

4. **ESSAYS** on **SUICIDE**, **MIRACLES**, and the **IMMORTALITY** of the **SOUL**. By **DAVID HUME**. Price 1s.

5. **WREATH** of **FREEDOM**, being a Collection of Songs in favour of Public Liberty; many of them are American Republican Songs, which are in no other collection. Price 1s. 6d.

6. **MANIA** of **EMIGRATING** to the **UNITED STATES**, **EXPOSED**. Price 1s.

7. **DEFOE'S TRUE-BORN ENGLISHMAN**. Price 6d.

8. **FUN BOX BROKE OPEN; or LOTTERIES EXPOSED**. Price 6d.

9. **Mr. Clark** has a few copies of **SHERWIN'S LIFE** of **PAINE**. Price 7s. 6d. This is the only work that has done justice to the memory of **Mr. Paine**.

10. **TRIFLING MISTAKE**, by **JOHN CAM HOBHOUSE, M. P.** for **WESTMINSTER**. For the writing and publishing of this pamphlet, **Mr.**

**Hobhouse** was sent to **Newgate** by the then existing House of Parliament. Price 1s. 8vo.

#### NEW SYSTEM of ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

Just published, price 3s. boards, dedicated to **Sir Gerard Noel, Bart.**

**A GRAMMAR** of the **ENGLISH LANGUAGE**, in which the Genius of the English Tongue is consulted, and all imitations of the Greek and Latin Grammars are discarded; adapted to the comprehension of persons desirous of teaching themselves, and intended for the use of Schools and Young Persons in general. To which is added a brief View of the Discoveries of **Mr. Horne Tooke** in the Formation of Language.

By **WILLIAM GREATHEED LEWIS**.

Printed and Published by **T. Dolby**, 299, Strand, London, and sold by all Booksellers.

#### The QUEEN'S RIGHT to be CROWNED.

This day is published, price 1s.

**THE QUEEN'S MEMORIAL** to the **KING** in Council, claiming her right to participate in the approaching solemnity; with the eloquent and impressive appeals of Messrs. **Brougham**, **Denman**, &c. to the Privy Council in support of her Majesty's claims; containing a Legal and Historical Review of the Coronation of **Queen's Consort** of England from the earliest periods to the present time.

Printed and published by **T. Dolby**, 30, Holywell-street, and 34, Wardour-street, Soho.